

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1841.

[PAYABLE WITHIN FOUR MONTHS.]

VOL. XIV. NO. 11.



POETRY.

THE BIBLE.

Att—“Woodman spare that tree.”
Skeptic, spare that tree,
Touch not a single leaf,
Nor on its pines look
With eye of unbelief;
’Twas my forefather’s stay
In the hour of agony:
Skeptic, go thy way,
And let that old book be.

That good old book of life
For centuries has stood,
Unharm’d amid the strife
When the earth was drunk with blood;
And would’st thou harm it now,
And have its truths forgot?
Skeptic, forbear thy blow,
Thy hand shall harm it not.

In very name recalls
The happy hours of youth,
When in my grandfathers’ halls
I heard its tales of truth;
I’ve seen his white hairs flow
O’er that volume as he read,
But that was long ago,
And the good old man is dead.

My dear grandmother, too,
When I was but a boy,
I have seen her eyes of blue,
Weep o’er its tears of joy;
Their traces linger still,
And dear they are to me;
Skeptic, forbear thy will,
Go, let that old book be.

MISCELLANY.

The following singular narrative appears in a late number of the Cincinnati Gazette. It presents a remarkable instance of reunion in the members of a family separated for nearly twenty-four years.—N. Y. Spec.

TO THE PUBLIC.

Having recently discovered that my ancestral name is Wilmire, to obviate all suspicion of having changed my name through design, I submit the following narrative.

I was born in Switzerland, in the canton of Argau, and left that country about the year 1816, emigrating with my father’s family, which consisted of a father, mother and seven children, all sons. We arrived at Amsterdam, in Holland, at which we were purposed to take shipping for North America. We were there detained awhile by the difficulty of procuring shipping. The vessel in which we eventually secured a passage was so much crowded with emigrant passengers that previous to our setting sail a most destructive pestilence broke out among the crew, to which the greater portion of the passengers fell victims. Among the dead were my father, mother and three brothers; also an uncle and his whole family, who had travelled with us from home to that place. Thus were four brothers of us, all in our childhood, left to pursue our journey under those unhappy circumstances to a strange land, without a friend to direct or to comfort us.

After a tedious and distressing passage, we landed at Newcastle in the state of Delaware. We then became separated, and were put out among strangers, whose language we could neither speak nor understand, and had no knowledge of each other’s place of residence. For about twenty-four years I have had no correct information of the existence or residence of either of my brothers, excepting my brother John, with whom I have had some intercourse, and who was also known by the name of Roof.

As regards myself, the first years of my residence in the United States were spent in the lower part of Pennsylvania. From thence I went to Frederick city, Maryland, where I learned the skin-dressing & gloving business. After remaining in Frederick about five years, I went to Hagerstown, in the same state, where I exercised my trade of skin-dressing and gloving for about four years. While residing in Hagerstown, I married Miss Christina Crogrow of Frederick.

From Hagerstown I removed to the state of Ohio, living six months in Dayton. I went from thence to Columbus, where I remained three years, during which time I studied Divinity under Professor Schmidt, of the German Seminary. In April, 1834, I accepted a call from the Evangelical Lutheran Congregation at Circleville, and took charge thereof, where I have ever since resided.

Until the 31st day of last month, I had obtained no knowledge of either of my brothers excepting John, when, to my great surprise and joy, Mr. Joseph Wilmire presented, and identified himself as my brother. The loss of my true name has probably prevented our discovering each other at an earlier period. This change of name is left to conjecture, but we supposed may be accounted for in this manner: The name of my uncle, who, with his whole family, died on board the vessel as above stated, and who was my mother’s brother, was Roof.

Those who took me and my brother John into their keeping on our arrival in this country, may have seen that name on the ship’s register or papers, and may have taken us to be the surviving members of that family. Our extreme youth, and ignorance of the language, prevented us from

putting them right. My brother, who is now here, was older, and of sufficient age to preserve his name. I also learn from him that he has discovered and identified our youngest brother.

I have a desire to resume my paternal name, but the great inconvenience which would attend the change induces me to retain the name by which I have always been known, since I could understand the English language. This determination will not be considered disrespectful to the memory of my parents, for it is the name of one of them.

By the name of Roof I was naturalized—in that name I have transacted all my business. By that name I was married—in that name I received my license to preach the Gospel—in that name I took charge of my congregation—and by that name I hold the title to my property. To take another at this time would be an extremely awkward business, both for myself, my family, and my acquaintances. I believe, therefore, that my course in this matter will be approved by my friends and the public.

JOSEPH ANTHONY ROOF.
Circleville, Nov. 2, 1841.

Tobacco a Remedy for Arsenic.—A young lady in New Hampshire fell into the mistake, so often committed, of eating a portion of arsenic which had been prepared for the destruction of rats. Painful symptoms soon led to injury, and her mistake was discovered. An elderly lady who was present, advised that she should be made to vomit, as speedily as possible, and as she had always felt a perfect loathing for tobacco in every shape, it was supposed that this would at once effect the purpose. A pipe was used, but without producing a nausea. She next chewed a large portion of strong tobacco, and swallowed the juice, and that even, without a sensation of disgust.

A strong decoction was then made of hot water, of which she drank perhaps half a pint. Still there was neither nausea nor dizziness, nor did it operate at all, either as an emetic or cathartic. The painful sensations at her stomach, however, subsided, and she began to feel well. On the arrival of a physician an emetic of blue vitriol was administered, and produced one operation.—One or two days after there was a discharge of dark green color approaching to black. No ill consequence followed.

Another case occurred in the same place a few years subsequent, in which arsenic was taken through mistake, by a sick person, and she employed tobacco with the same success. She, too, had always loathed the article, but now chewed it, and swallowed the saliva, without producing sickness at the stomach. No emetic was administered nor any other remedy.—Silliman’s Journal.

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 27, 1841.

For the Telegraph.

Frequent removals of Ministers.—No. 1.

For a number of years past the enquiry has often been made—what is the cause of the frequent removals of ministers? Though I may be unable to point out the true cause, or causes, yet I will venture to “show mine opinion.” Much indeed is it to be regretted that there is so little permanence to the pastoral relation. But it is entirely useless to sit down in despair and make no efforts to produce a reformation, which is so imperiously demanded by the cause of our holy religion. To suppose that this evil originates in one cause is to commit an egregious error in the outset of our investigation. The causes are many! and both Ministers and churches are guilty in this matter requiring vigilance in investigation and promptness in action on the part of both.

1. **Churches settle Ministers without sufficient acquaintance.** Acquaintance with ministers should be thorough and satisfactory, in order to a settlement which shall be profitable to either or both of the parties. To hear a man once or twice, as a public speaker, is in many instances all that is necessary, previous to his being called, and settled as a pastor. Such is altogether too superficial an acquaintance in a matter so awfully important. There should be sufficient time for trial, to give a fair knowledge of his talents, piety, doctrine and adaptedness to the place he is to occupy. However, there should be no expectation of perfection, even in the best of men; for all have some failings, more or less. Neglecting the above precaution, many churches soon get sick of their Pastor, and say, “we did not know him; he is not the man for us.” A year or two at most, must suffice; and the poor minister must “take his staff and travel on” saying, “I have no home or stay with you,” broken-hearted and disgusted with the fickleness of the churches. Churches often expect too much, altogether. They forget that ministers are but men, and that they as well as others claim of us forbearance and brotherly love; even those who appear to be nearest what they should be and what we wish.

2. **Churches are too frequently governed by a few.** And as much in hiring and dismissing ministers as any other matters.—Baptist churches, especially, profess to be organized on republican principles, govern-

ed by the will or voice of the majority.—But we may justly fear that this is not the case in very many instances. And even when there is an aristocracy, it is not an aristocracy of intelligence, but of money.—Dollars and cents are of more worth than even piety and intelligence. Nor is this the worst of the case. I could mention a church where a single female has within a few years been the reputed cause of the removal of two or more ministers, both of whom were excellent men, but did not happen to suit this female Sanballat. Men of property and standing are the principal ones concerned in engaging and dismissing pastors, agreeable to their interests or prejudices. The paramount question often is, what will it suit this or that man? Not whether it is God’s truth or not. Indeed, some members suppose if by faithfulness a minister becomes obnoxious to the displeasure of the ungodly he ought to lose his subscription and be turned away.

3. **Many churches cannot bear the truth on all subjects.** It may be that on some subjects they will bear to be plainly dealt with; but on others they are easily excited, and commence fault-finding. Some subjects are naturally delicate, and others more so because of the guilt of churches or members. Wherever there is a determination to neglect duty or commit evil, by churches & individuals, he who has the temerity to do his duty faithfully, exposes himself to the opposition either secret or avowed, of the party concerned. The whole truth is what does the business in the dismissal of many a pastor. The cry is soon raised, “he is too personal—he is unpopular, and gives offence—away with him!” It will not do to call things by their right names, or preach holiness of heart and life in all things.—Some little sins must be retained as the house-gods of the heathen, for the peculiar interests of the parties concerned. O, the idolatry of the Church, and her fear of the light of truth! Churches have reason to fear the withering curse of God for their participation in sin and neglect to help with their ministers.

4. **Want of punctuality in meeting engagements with the minister.** Ministers have wants, rights and character to look after and attend to; but how can this be done, unless churches meet their engagements in paying him at the time. Other debts are paid, at the time; but this is left to the mercy of circumstances. Are not many removals because the man is not rewarded, & thus loses confidence in the church, becomes embarrassed, and beset with a multitude of cares and difficulties. The wonder is that so many disappointed ministers continue to preach or repose any confidence in churches; or that they do not go into some other business for a livelihood. To cheat a merchant out of five dollars, would be dishonorable; but to cheat a minister of Jesus out of fifty dollars seems to be no crime at all! But it is indeed robbing God.

A. K.

From the Non-Resistant.

Third Annual Report of the New-England Non-Resistance Society.

(Continued.)

In the Boston Recorder of March 19th, a communication was published, entitled “Remarkable Coincidence,”—the design of which was to prove, (because they are agreed in some particulars,) that the infidels of the French revolution and modern non-resistance are to be classed together in ferocity and impiety! The writer concludes as follows:

1st. Is infidelity and non-resistance the same thing?

2d. Is it right to call non-resistance principles and operations infidelity?

3d. Can any genuine non-resistance complain, these things being so, of being called an infidel?

4th. Is it right to class non-resistance with Brownsonism and Kneelandism?

5th. Would it be safe for the moralists of such a school as the French infidels to plead the cause of human rights, even in enlightened New England?

6th. Have we not reason to suspect that moralists of such a school have corrupt motives at the foundation of all their movements?

7th. Is it proper for the Christian to hear them plead for the rights of the poor slave, even?

J. S.

A reply to this artful and malicious attack was sent to the Editor of the Recorder; but, though it was couched in mild, dispassionate terms, it was not allowed a place in the columns of that paper! Language is inadequate to depict the meanness, injustice, and moral cowardice of such a course. From this excellent reply, the following passages are selected, which exhibit in a very clear light the absurd reasoning of the Recorder’s correspondent:

“The coincidences pointed out by your correspondent are truly remarkable. I am in doubt which most to admire, his logic, the extent and accuracy of his information, or his fairness and candor. Perhaps they may all be considered superlative. But since he has not exhausted the field of coincidences, allow me to add a few to his list.

1st. The infidels of the French revolution aimed their malicious shafts at the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope. They opposed to these claims their united powers of wit, argument, contempt, and sarcasm, and set themselves in determined opposition to any recognition of the Papal authority by the nation in which they lived. The Orthodox clergy of New England, as one of their prominent features, are now opposing the same thing.

2d. The infidels of France denied, despised and ridiculed the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Orthodox clergy of New England agree with them exactly in this particular.

3d. The infidels of France vented their malice and peculiar bitterness at the practice of auricular confession. They pretended that there was no sufficient reason why men should confess their sins to a priest, and boldly averred that priests had no power to pardon sin. The Orthodox clergy of New England hold precisely the same sentiments.

4th. The infidels of France maintained, in the most positive terms, that it was useless and absurd to bow down before pictures and images. Every Orthodox clergyman in New England will make the same assertions.

5th. The infidels of France opposed a monarchical government, and eulogized the republican system in the highest terms. The Orthodox clergy of New England have been doing precisely the same thing for the last half century.

Being filled with astonishment and wonder in view of these coincidences, I cannot forbear proposing some few questions.

1st. Are Infidelity and Orthodoxy the same thing?

2d. Can any genuine Orthodox clergyman complain, these things being so, of being called an infidel?

3d. Is it not right to class Orthodoxy with Brownsonism and Kneelandism?

4th. Is it proper for a Christian to countenance an Orthodox clergyman in doing any good action whatever?

Nearly all the professedly religious journals in the land are opposed to the non-resistance enterprise; through the columns of which, non-resistance is not permitted to be heard in self-defence, though all who choose to misrepresent or assault them are allowed to do so to any extent. The Western Messenger, however, is a remarkable exception to this general rule. It has noticed, in a long and well-written article, the formation of the New England Non-Resistance Society; and, though dissenting from some of the doctrines of the Society, it has had the magnanimity to copy a large portion of the Constitution and Declaration of Sentiments, appending to the same the following candid remarks:

“We have purposely allowed this Society to speak for itself. We think so new and important a movement in the moral world should be fully understood, and that no garbled extracts from its own explanations, and no taunts nor misrepresentations of its enemies, should convey to men’s minds the knowledge of its character.

One would suppose that a doctrine so mild and peaceful, so full of love and abhorrence of injury, would have been hailed with gladness, in this warring and distressed world—and that, where so many complain of persecution, in some way or other, or of suffering from the organization of society, men would have rejoiced in any offered means of relief; and especially when that means purports to be founded on the very gospel of our Savior, and on the holiest affections of our own hearts. But far otherwise has this messenger of peace been received. Instead of giving it the cordial hand of brotherly welcome, most papers, and particularly religious journals, have either shrunk from it, as a polluting thing, or have noticed it with jeers and bitterness. Some have only given it taunting epithets, as ‘milk-and-water religion,’ ‘pandemonium paradise,’ &c. Others have shown to their readers nothing but the errors of the sect. Few have generously and manfully told the whole truth concerning it.

This Society, composed of but a handful of individuals, gathered in a remote but bright corner of our nation, has taken hold of its work in good earnest, and its members seem to understand both the material upon which they are to operate, and the means by which they are to effect their purpose. We know them to be men and women of pure hearts and intelligent understandings. They are aware how much obprobrium will be thrown upon them by the proud and timid, who are afraid to follow meekness, lest the world should call them cowards. They are conscious how few they can get even to examine their doctrine, and how much it must be known to men only through the condemnations and taunts of its enemies.

With these obstacles before them, they have gone resolutely onward, and published the Non-Resistant, a semi-monthly paper, and several tracts for the diffusion of their principles. How widely their journal is circulated we know not, nor how many it has converted to their faith. We do not look for a great party to join them. They may always be a small and despised number, every where spoken against; yet we believe the cause of love and peace will gain much by their exertions. Though they may persuade but few to openly espouse their doctrine, yet they will very materially influence and modify the sentiments of those who oppose or are ashamed of them.”

The reviewer, after censuring non-resistance for vituperative language, concludes as follows:

“Yet with all their faults, we deem these non-resistance true coadjutors in the Christian reform. We bid them welcome to their place in the vineyard of Christ. They have their mission to fulfil; and so far as they are faithful to their purpose, and recommend themselves to us, we shall ourselves profit by their teaching; and our readers shall enjoy the fruit of their labors. But, in as far as they wander from their true principles of peace and love, and send forth error to misguide, we will be faithful to our trust, and warn them of their mistake, and caution the world against them.”

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

To the Editor of the Ch. Watchman:

Dear Sir,—The following lines appeared originally in the Edinburgh Literary Journal. Reading them over the other Sabbath morning, I felt inclined ‘to prolong the strain,’ and so added two stanzas, which I leave at your disposal.

Respectfully yours,

Boston, Oct. 18, 41. R. TURNBULL.

PRAY WITHOUT CEASING.

Go when the morning shineth,
Go when the noon is bright,
Go when the eve declineth,
Go in the hush of night;
Go with pure mind and feeling,
Fling earthly thought away,
And in thy chamber kneeling,
Do thou in secret pray.

Remember all who love thee,
All who are loved by thee,
Pray too for those that hate thee,
If any such there be;
Then for thyself in meekness
A blessing humbly claim,
And link with each petition
The great Redeemer’s name.

Or if his e’er denied thee
In solitude to pray,—
Should holy thoughts come o’er thee,
When friends are round thy way,
E’en then the silent breathing
Of thy spirit raised above,
Will reach His throne of glory
Who is mercy, truth, and love.

Oh! not a joy or blessing
With this can we compare,
The pow’r that He hath giv’n us
To pour our souls in prayer;
Whene’er thou pin’st in sadness,
Before His footstool fall,
And remember in thy gladness
His grace who gave thee all.

Thus in thy youthful morning,
And in thy manhood’s day,
At night, when life is fading,
Do thou unceasing pray;
Ah! never in thy sadness
Do thou forget the throne,
And in thy spirit’s gladness
His grace neglect to own.

Thus onward o’er the ocean
Of life’s tempestuous way,
With strong and steady motion,
Thy spirit’s wings shall play,
Fann’d by the breath of paradise,
Shall soar far, far on high,
Then light amid heaven’s glories,
In scenes beyond the sky.

From the Christian Investigator.

THE “TEST QUESTION” STATED—EXPLAINED—DISCUSSED—OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

Objections Considered.

Objection I. The introduction of this test question among the northern churches is a groundless imputation upon them.—We are not so corrupt as to render the consideration of the question necessary.

Objection II. The introduction of this test is directly calculated, if not designed, to “drive the plough share of division” through the churches at the North.

Answer. We put these two objections side by side, to see how they compare with each other. The first supposes that there is not enough of the pro-slavery spirit in our churches, to call for the introduction of the test. The second, supposes that there is so much of this spirit, that the test will, of necessity, divide churches asunder!—The one objection, therefore, confutes and contradicts the other.

If the first objection be well founded, the introduction of the test must be harmless, and will encounter little or no opposition. If the second be well founded, then the test is much needed, and nothing else can save the churches from utter apostasy and extinction.

The real fact may perhaps be found to lie between the extremes of the two rival objections. There may be a dangerous leaven of errors to be purged out, and yet it may be done without so extensive and general a division of the churches as is apprehended. The people, when well informed, may be found, in most cases, to be less corrupt than the leading influences that now mislead and control them. The rapid changes now going on, in the churches in the interior of the country, strongly favor this conclusion.

Objection III. By taking the affirmative side of the questions, we should be obliged, in most cases, (being a minority,) to go out of the churches in order to reform them; whereas, the only way to exert an influence upon the churches, is to continue in them.

Answer. The course proposed does not require us to go out of the church until the effort has been fairly made for its reformation, and without success. We have then no evidence that it is a Christian church, and have no right to continue in it.

Until we urge the claims of the Anti-Slavery cause in the churches, as a test question of religion and morals, we do not even begin to use the proper measures for their reformation. It is no part of the proposed plan, to break away from the churches with which we are connected until this effort is faithfully and patiently made.

Objection IV. The Saviour instructs us, by a parable, that the kingdom of heaven is like leaven. The friends of Christian liberty, therefore, should remain, as leaven in the churches.

Answer. So they should, until the effect is ascertained, and until it is proved to be unavailing. The Saviour does not tell us that all men are to be leavened, nor that we are to remain where we are doing no good, and exposing ourselves to corruption from the bad leaven of others.—The parable (Matt. xiii. 33.) illustrates the progress of truth in the world at large. It does not bind us to remain in a corrupt church. On the contrary, the same figure is used to illustrate the corrupting influence of false professors.—“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.”—“Purge out, therefore, the old leaven.”—“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.” 1 Cor. v. 6. In this latter place, the figure is used to show the necessity of cutting off impure members from the church. The Saviour, therefore, could not have intended that his use of the same figure should be quoted as a reason against church discipline, or (what is the same thing) against coming out from an anti-Christian church.

Objection V. The Savior and his apostles did not leave a corrupt church, until they were thrust out, as the blind man, who had been healed, was cast out of the synagogue. Paul stood his ground among the Jews, till he was rejected, before he turned from them to the Gentiles. The Savior also went into the synagogues and taught.

Answer. The fact that the Savior and his apostles taught in the synagogues, shows at least, that they were not prohibited from doing so. Laymen though they were, carpenters and fishermen, not belonging to the priesthood, heretics as they were esteemed, they nevertheless had free access to the ears of the people, in the synagogues, without even the ceremony, so far as we learn, of asking leave of either Trustees or Committee. Corrupt and despotic as were the chief priests, idolized as they were by the people, and justly claiming, as they did, the exclusive prerogatives of the sons of Aaron, under a dispensation far less open and popular than the present, it does not appear that they had so far infringed upon ancient Jewish usages as to question the right of every church member, every Hebrew, to open his lips in exhortation, in the sacred temple, even though the withering denunciation of their own oppressive priesthood and rulers were the topic of discussion.—Not! Such a stretch of ecclesiastical authority was left for the republican protestantism of the puritans, of the nineteenth century, in America—the land of equal rights. It was reserved for the professed disciples of Him, who, when describing the authority of the lords of the Gentiles, added, “so shall it not be among you.”

The Savior and his apostles, therefore, if members of the Hebrew church, were members of a church that did not close its doors against the advocacy of human rights—against the reproof of tyrants—that did not bolt its pulpits (if it had any) even against laymen, and on the Sabbath, when they wished to preach “the gospel of deliverance to the captives”—that did not do this, at least, till the persecutions broke out, that drove them, not only from the church, but so far as possible, from the world. While admitted a place in the church, they exercised the privileges of its “free discussion” polity.

Not so with the friends of reformation in our times. Had the Savior and his apostles been counteracted, by the authorities of the Jewish church, as abolitionists now are, the cases would have been nearer a parallel than at present.

But how does it appear that Christ and his apostles remained in religious fellowship with the chief priests, the scribes and the Pharisees? Does it appear in the Savior’s denunciations of them, recorded in the 23d chapter of Matt.—and in the sermon of Peter, (Acts iv.) and the speech of Stephen, (Acts vii.) and in the Epistles to the churches?

Be it so, that there was no formal secession from the Hebrew church—the cases are not parallel. The Jewish church, unlike Christian churches, was a national church. The entire nation, whether pious or impious—whether devout or profane, were its members. For this arrangement God had wise reasons. But they no longer exist. They do not apply to the new dispensation. We have another church polity now. Isaiah might denounce the impurity of a church from which he might not secede. But when John describes such a church, in New Testament times, he denounces her, not Zion, but Babylon—and he repeats the divine mandate “Come out of her, my people.” And the reason of this difference is obvious. Ecclesiastical connection implies religious fellowship, under the New Testament economy.

After all, what is it to be thrust out of the churches, in the sense in which Christ and his apostles were thrust out? Does it need a formal and authoritative act of excommunication? Shall we conclude that